

Marina Lent

From: Marina Lent <boh@chilmarkma.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 9:10 AM
To: 'chilchoc85@verizon.net' (chilchoc85@verizon.net); 'Dan Greenbaum'; 'sbflan@comcast.net'; 'billmeegan@verizon.net' (billmeegan@verizon.net); 'rrappaport@rrklaw.net'; Janet Weidner; 'slaterjn@comcast.net'; 'James Malkin'
Subject: FW: notes on comparative analysis from Chris Murphy

Jim -- will post in tomorrow's Agenda and on Correspondence page.

M

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Murphy [mailto:88chilmark@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 01, 2014 8:56 AM
To: marina lent
Subject: notes on comparative analysis

Dear Janet, Dan and whoever else is working on the comparative analysis; I cannot figure an easy way to write comments so please bear with me .

On draft #3 going down each column,
Causeway #1,

properties traversed – all the causeways come very close to the Orphanos \ Jeffers lot line. For lots under 3 ac. I think most structures within the 35' setback require written approval of the abutter. Lenny Jason recently came to the BOA and made clear that a permanent fence over 4' is a structure and requires a permit and such written permission. Surely any of the causeways will be treated the same way and that should be noted in your considerations.

Access: reliability this is only OK in the very short term

Beach expansion: the answer here is only yes if you are referring to adding footage along toward the Mussel shoal but if you look at the original proposal it will require revetments to protect both ends that will cause the same kind of problems that the current revetment is causing and will degrade the swimming beach we all want to see restored.

Enhancement in front of existing parking lot. The answer is yes only if all the existing revetment is removed and that is not what is proposed with any of the causeway proposals.

Coastal dune impacts: this two lane road thing is un-necessary and leading us all astray. The Quenames\Quansoo road handles more beach goers and home owners and their vehicles with one lane and long stretches without a turnout. So will Squibnocket road regardless of where the parking lot ends up. There will, however, be a major dune impact with each of the causeway proposals and that is the east end with its proposed re-enforcements and abutments that will have to grow as the ocean approaches.

Overland water: I am not sure what this means but the original selectmen's proposal (causeway #1) also proposed a dune

Durability longevity : in the end this entire causeway will have to be removed and a new solution found.

Approvals: in the end any work on the barrier beach or in or near the wetlands needs ConCom approval, which the DEP reviews. Any project on the barrier beach will also need MVC review. None of the issues are minor but none are automatic game changers either.

Reconstruction: absolutely. At 2.2' per yr the whole causeway will be on the beach in the not so distant future and need removal not reconstruction

Financial: initial cost -- 3-4 million is the number being batted about

Periodic cost-- rising as the ocean gets nearer Eventually total replacement at much higher costs but Where? Permit revenue -- Depends on the quality of the beach. More leased beach and renewing the lease farther into the future is important but the people who come to swim care more about the quality

Causeway #2 and #3 See above. They all have about the same issues.

Dune road and Dune at grade are both presentations from the FOS but now they are focused on 'dune at grade' : general – the dune only starts out 'manmade' because man has destroyed the dune that was there. Once the dune is reconstructed it will mostly maintain itself as does the rest of the barrier beach but it will need help. Most of the help is just good management procedures, ie: sand fence, people fence, beach grass planting, etc. Occasionally, after a major storm the dune may need some re-nourishment. To see same dune same area just look to the other side of Money Hill. That dune does not get replaced every ten years it just slowly moves back.

Size: dune is approximately the same size as the one in the causeway proposals

Access:

Reliability – feasibility of a ten foot roadway is no more questionable than that of a causeway. See engineering studies presented by FOS and note lack of engineering studies or information in causeway proposals.

Property availability: The owners of the two half acre lots have both indicated that they want to and will work with the Town. They can't be expected to go much further until there is a proposal on the table Beach expansion: SFHA has said their interest is in a good access. Solve that and we can negotiate the beach expansion Enhancement in front of existing parking lot: removing the revetments reestablishes the beach. The dune behind it will help protect the road and help feed the beach

Wetlands: The 'wet lands' under consideration are already degraded by the march of the shoreline landward and the movement of material used to surface the parking lot. The wetlands are an issue but not a major issue Property Requirements: the owners of lots 17.3 and 17.4 have said they will work with the town and the owners of lot 17.3 have agreed already to access and parking

Noise: The construction of the dune and road would be similar in truck flow and noise to any major house construction project that happens in town right now

Maintenance: small, regular road maintenance as is done on the rest of the road annually and occasional more significant repairs when needed

Reconstruction: No more noticeable than on the rest of the road. Following a truly major storm some reconstruction may be necessary. In the past the reconstruction has been necessary because of damage to the manmade structures and the areas immediately adjacent to them

Financial: initial cost the best estimate is between 2 and 3 hundred thousand.

Annual cost: 5-10 thousand but most years much less.

Periodic cost: for small amounts of material and tractor work

Payer: SFHA for the ROW road and the town for the parking area and beach related expenses State funds avail. : the CZM funds should become available for the revetment removal no matter what plan is finally permitted

Burm\culverts: I don't think this idea is actually on anyone's list any longer. However, the concept has some merit. If such a raised roadway were constructed along the line of the current FOS roadway and the revetments completely removed the beach would begin to restore a dune where the back of the parking lot is now. A manmade dune simply helps speed up the process